

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18441

Louisiana, to help us work out a good business arrangement, for that is what the intent of the language really is. This arrangement is to be used in only certain countries. We have been given a list of the countries in which it is proposed to be used, together with the amount of money that will be allocated to each country. There are only seven: Argentina, Peru, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, and Saudi Arabia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Some of those are countries that I had named when I spoke on my amendment. The Senator from Alabama knows very well what could happen.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I heard the Senator's remarks. I realize the truth of what he says. But I believe it would be well for us to have in the RECORD a statement of the intent.

It is not a case of saying to gunrunners, "If you sell to this country, that country, or some other country, the United States will guarantee your sales." It is not a gunrunning program. It is a program, first of all, that would have to be authorized under the military assistance program. Second, export licenses would have to be issued by the government. It could not be a gunrunning program, by any means.

I am willing to let the language be stricken and to go to conference with the situation as it would then be.

Mr. ELLENDER. My purpose in presenting the amendment to the Senate is to have that language stricken.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We cannot strike it finally; the Senator understands that, does he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but I wish, at least, to strike the language from the Senate bill. That is my purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am willing to do that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under those conditions, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on this amendment may be rescinded and that the Senate may be permitted to vote. In that event, I shall ask for the approval of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the yeas and nays is rescinded. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7301) to amend section 341 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of

the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9653) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. CURTIS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4649) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. CURTIS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer-term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. CURTIS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8864) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. CURTIS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10222) to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and

offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. THOMAS, Mr. EVINS, Mr. MAHON, Mr. OSTERTAG, and Mr. JONAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11369) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. SIKES, Mr. MAHON, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. CEDERBERG were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1211 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new subsection:

"(g) At the end thereof add the following new section:

"SEC. 621. LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE IN FISCAL YEAR 1965.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the aggregate of the total amounts authorized to be appropriated for use during the fiscal year 1965 for furnishing assistance and for administrative expenses under this Act shall not exceed \$3,000,000,000."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I ask for the yeas and nays, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request. Legislative counsel has informed me that a technical change should be made in the amendment. "Section 621" should read, instead, "Section 620(A)." I ask unanimous consent that the technical change be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished majority leader for a moment. It will make a great deal of difference in the presentation of my amendment if I may have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. I should like to have a sufficient number of Senators in the Cham-

ber so that I may ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to speak at length. Each Member of this body knows whether or not he agrees with the advocates of the amendment that the bill should be limited to a total authorization of \$3 billion. That is what my amendment provides.

We have been told for many years that a policy of our Government is to reduce the amount of foreign aid. The policy of our Government is to get more and more of the private segment of the economy to take over the investment program and to increase the amount of the foreign aid program that now involves the taxpayers' dollars instead of private dollars.

Mr. President, the bill the administration has offered is called a "bare-bones" bill, but it forgets to tell us that a skeleton can carry lots of fat. There is still a lot of fat in this bill. The bill calls for more money than was appropriated last year by half a billion dollars plus.

My amendment only asks for an authorization of the amount of money appropriated last year, which is not in keeping with the promises made in the past several years, that each year the amount would be less.

The sum of \$3 billion is too much money. I believe that we should have an authorization bill of \$2.5 billion maximum. However, I try to be a stark realist in my job; therefore, I propose an amendment which can be characterized as an understatement. It is too much, but at least the Senate should vote for a limitation of \$3 billion, the amount of money which was appropriated last year.

Mr. President, one argument was used in the Foreign Relations Committee that had no place in the committee. It is an argument which never should have been made, and it came from the White House, that if the administration did not get its \$3.5 billion, it wished the Congress to know that it would ask for a supplemental appropriation. I resented it, and rightly so. It is the obligation, let me once again inform the executive branch of the Government under our system of checks and balances, for the Congress to decide what the authorization should be. Then the Executive has the duty to act in good faith to try to carry out the program within that authorization, in the absence of an emergency.

I consider it to be quite improper for the administration to threaten in advance, "Give me \$3½ billion or I shall be up for a supplemental appropriation."

That is a misuse of Executive power. I believe that if there were no other reasons for giving them \$3 billion, that would be enough—although there are other reasons.

Congress should never yield to the threat of the executive branch that we either give them what they demand or they will come up with a supplemental appropriation.

We have a supplemental appropriation procedure, and we have a supple-

mentary procedure to take care of emergencies, to take care of unforeseen conditions which may develop after an authorization and an appropriation; but that is the only basis upon which a President has any justification for ever asking for a supplemental appropriation.

In my 20 years of service in the Senate, I have never known a President before to threaten the Congress with a request for a supplemental appropriation, before the Congress had even passed an authorization or an appropriation bill. The administration should learn that that approach to Congress is not going to be supported.

We should not be voting more than \$3 billion, if we are going to keep faith with the promises which have been made to the people of this country, that we are going to reduce foreign aid year by year, and that we are going to encourage the private segment of the economy to take over more and more of the investment problem.

The sum of \$3 billion is a terrific amount of money. But \$3 billion does not involve all the millions of dollars which the American people are paying out in foreign assistance.

We have to watch the semantics of the State Department and the AID people.

Foreign assistance is one thing. Foreign aid is something substantially different.

Foreign aid is the smaller amount, the lesser program which is involved in the bill. But we have a whole variety of other expenditures of the Federal Government which add up to foreign assistance.

Do not forget that the bill does not cover the expenses and the costs of military American establishments abroad. They amount to huge sums of money.

They are of vital concern to the security and the protection of many countries around the world. In fact, it happens to be those military expenditures, and not the military aid aspect of the bill, which give to the countries their security, their protection, and their defense.

Does anyone really believe that the military aid we give to India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Turkey, Greece, Taiwan, and South Vietnam amounts to anything with respect to the defense of our country? Of course it does not.

It is being used, by and large, for these countries to build up their military forces to carry on wars against each other.

We are living through an hour of it in the Mediterranean now.

If ever there was need for proof of the position I have been taking for some years past in regard to the waste of American taxpayers' money in military aid for Greece and Turkey, we are getting proof of it now.

Building up the military power of Greece and Turkey has not strengthened the security of the United States, it has increased the danger of war in the Mediterranean.

Building up the military power of Pakistan and India has not increased the security of the United States. It has increased the danger of war in that part of the world over Kashmir.

If anyone believes that Formosa is of any military assistance to the United States, they could not be more wrong, for the security of Formosa is dependent upon the presence of the Seventh Fleet, the American air armada, and the thousands of American boys distributed throughout the Pacific.

I shall inform the Senate in a moment of the kind of military aid I shall continue to support, although much of it is excess baggage; but instead of pouring American taxpayers' dollars into many parts of the world to support excesses in military aid, it would be much better for the welfare of those countries if the same amount of money were to go into economic development, into preparing the seedbeds of economic freedom so that political freedom can take root and grow, because in most of these countries political freedom is nonexistent.

They have a form of political freedom in India. It is not working too well. But, by and large, the countries into which we are pouring millions of American taxpayers' dollars for military aid are not politically free nations at all.

Turkey is a thoroughly totalitarian military dictatorship. We are not only supporting that dictatorship with our military aid and increasing the threat of war in the Mediterranean, but we are also, by and large, supporting an almost out-and-out socialist state in Turkey.

A large percentage of the major industries, operated by the Government as Government monopolies, is used as a form of employment doles, paid for in large measure by the American taxpayers. When are we going to stop it? Mr. President, we must put a ceiling on the foreign aid program. My \$3 billion proposal would do just that.

This amendment is the basic amendment to the money-cutting amendments, the specific items that will follow. I offer the amendment because I think Congress and the Senate ought to go on record and say, "\$3 billion is all you get this year."

I am perfectly willing to leave a considerable amount of discretion to AID and to the State Department to cut their cloth to meet the \$3 billion pattern.

I am not suggesting that we dictate to them in every aspect where the cuts should come. But we have a clear duty to carry out our checking obligation by saying, "It is \$3 billion—no more."

AID will have no difficulty in coming forth with a better foreign aid program by requiring the reallocation, reevaluation, and shifting of funds in the bill. This is another way—in this instance an indirect way—to force some reform of the policy of foreign aid in the State Department.

I started with my policy changes. I have offered my policy changes. To the extent that they were rejected, the amounts spent should be reduced. I shall now discuss the military aid issue and why I believe considerable reduction in it should be made.

I am willing to support military aid that is essential to helping a government to maintain internal order and protect

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18443

itself from internal revolution—particularly Communist revolution.

The type of aid that we are giving to India, Pakistan, Turkey, and Greece, is not the type of aid that they need to protect themselves from internal disorder. They certainly do not need jet fighters. They certainly do not at all need submarines. They certainly do not need naval craft of the armored type in the various classifications. They certainly do not need Sherman tanks. They certainly do not need heavy American equipment.

The sad thing is that that kind of equipment has also been used time and time again to suppress freedom. We have seen some shocking examples of it in the years gone by in Latin America, for example. We can cut heavily into American military aid and not weaken one iota the security of the countries involved, or the defenses of the United States. Every one of those countries is living under the canopy of American military air, naval, and nuclear power—and principally the last.

It is also recognized that if we get into war with Russia we shall be in a nuclear war, not a conventional one. The kind of military assistance that we make available to these countries will be of no help whatsoever in their defense.

This is one place where we can cut deeply into our foreign aid program. And we can cut deeply into supporting assistance. Supporting assistance is nothing but a semantic label for more military aid. The supporting assistance is merely the pouring of millions of American taxpayer dollars into countries to which we are giving military aid far in excess of what their own economy can support. Does anyone believe that Turkey's economy would support its military machine? Of course not. Neither could the economy of Greece, Pakistan, India, Formosa, or any of the other countries into which we pour heavy contributions for military assistance.

I have urged the cut of supporting assistance in the committee. I am urging it in the Senate Chamber. I have an amendment I may offer later which deals definitely with some drastic cuts in supporting assistance.

If I could persuade the administration to agree to transfer these military funds into an economic loan program for specific wealth-creating projects that would benefit the mass of the people living in a given country, raise their standard of living, and increase their purchasing power so that they can be economically free men and women, I would vote for more foreign aid than this administration, or preceding administrations, have asked for.

The senior Senator from Oregon is not opposed to foreign aid. I am unalterably opposed to a foreign aid program that in my opinion can be spelled out as being more or less a shakedown of the American people, a waste of the American people's resources, a weakening of our economy, and a foreign aid program that has led to a great threat to the peace in some parts of the world.

The type of foreign aid program that assists in a development of economic freedom in these countries is the only way in which we can bring political freedom to them. We cannot impose political freedom from the top down. People who are economically free will quickly become politically free.

It is a historic truism that is irrefutable. History has taught that lesson over and over again. No people of any country are ever politically free until they are first economically free.

I am a strong advocate of a foreign aid program based upon an emphasis of economic loans, project by project. More and more people in the country are beginning to grasp it. And more and more people are beginning to serve notice on their politicians that they had better grasp it.

The American people will support a foreign aid program on the basis of an economic loan program project by project. But they will not much longer support a foreign aid program that turns millions of dollars over on the basis of a government-to-government deal. Too much of that money gets in the pockets of politicians abroad.

It is too bad that the American people cannot have the facts made available to them. It is a shameful thing any of the facts and findings of the Comptroller General of the United States are marked confidential and secret. I have been pleading for the past several years to have the label "confidential and secret" lifted from the facts and findings, allowing the American people to know about the people's business. There is not a thing in any of those reports that does not constitute the people's business.

In a democracy there can never be a substitute for a full disclosure of the people's business. And the people are entitled to the facts. Would that I could give them to them, and would that I could speak of the conclusions in these reports without violating any rule of secrecy.

The Comptroller General of the United States has devastated the position of the State Department and the AID officials in regard to their foreign aid program in respect to waste, inefficiency, corruption, and mismanagement around the world in the administration of the foreign aid program. I have been pleading for a reform to meet the objections of the Comptroller General of the United States. All we get from the State Department are statements to the effect that, "We recognize this and we are trying to do something about it."

Mr. President, it is about time that they did something about it—not merely try to do something about it, but in fact make a substantial effort to do something about it.

Mr. President, if we really wish to strengthen the cause of political freedom around the world, we must strengthen the cause of economic freedom around the world. So I hope that next year, after we are through with the proffered conference in December and before the next foreign aid bill is prepared, they will sit down with some of us up here on the

Hill who have been dealing with foreign aid in the Foreign Relations Committee and try to see if we can reach a meeting of the minds with regard to some of the reforms which the State Department admits in its conferences with me ought to be adopted, but does not feel that this is the time to adopt them.

Last year we heard the statement that that was not the time either. But I believe at long last it is getting through the skulls of those in the State Department and the AID administration that the time has come when they must adopt some policy reforms if they are to continue to have majority support in the Congress. So I shall go into these conferences in December with the State Department people with only one objective in mind, and that is to try to work cooperatively with them to bring about some of the proposed policy reforms that will give us next year an aid bill that will not be subject to the criticisms set out in the minority views which I have filed with the Senate this year.

It is important that we try to reach a meeting of the minds before a bill is submitted, because I have found from experience that once an administration sends up a bill it is difficult for sincere Members of the Congress to go against the administration. On that point I disagree.

There is always a feeling of partisan party loyalty which causes many to say, "We think we ought to resolve all doubts in favor of the administration." So they become go-alongers. In view of that political reality, every effort ought to be made by all of us—those who criticize the bill and those who are supporting the bill—to try next December in good faith to see if we cannot reach an agreement for some major changes in policy in the foreign aid program so that we can have the unity that I would welcome. I would much prefer to be with the majority on foreign aid. But once again I cannot be with the majority this year, because in my judgment the majority has not carried out its obligations to reform foreign aid. The majority has walked away from last year's report of the committee. Read that report and read the report submitted this year. Senators will find that the committee has done nothing which it implied would be accomplished in the way of reforming foreign aid after the report was filed last year. We shall have a repetition of that evasion again next year until we first try informally to reach some understandings about policy changes in foreign aid before the bill is ever sent to the Senate. I shall look forward to that.

I shall continue for the rest of the debate to make the record against the bill. I am still waiting for the answers to the criticisms in the minority views.

If Senators will read the RECORD of the present debate up to the very moment I now speak, they will observe that the majority has not come to grips with the facts brought out in the minority views and the criticisms of existing policy. Why? Since an election is coming along in November, apparently there is a desire to get the subject behind

18444

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 11

us as fast as possible, with as little debate as possible.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for repeatedly making such cogent arguments and directing our attention to what he believes to be the shortcomings of the pending Foreign Assistance Act. I have not supported him except in the two instances in which I voted for amendments that he offered in this forum during the debate. But I desire the RECORD to reflect the fact that I have considered very carefully the arguments which have been presented by our colleague on all of his proposals. I wish further to state that I sense increasing uneasiness in the State of West Virginia on the part of the constituency which I have the responsibility to represent in regard to the amounts of money which are sent to other countries and the manner in which those funds are used.

The current debate, in which the Senator from Oregon has spearheaded the opposition, is a wholesome exchange of views and convictions. It is a debate which is constructive and it focuses attention on the necessity of weighing most carefully the continuation, on this massive scale, of financial support to countries of the earth. We can, Mr. President, be profligate. We must not overextend the resources of our people and our Republic in this area of aid to other peoples and countries lest we weaken our own land and wear thin the cooperative effort of our citizenry.

The Senator from Oregon has spoken bluntly many times during these days. I have wondered if, perhaps he did not speak too bluntly. But I know it is due to the zealotness with which he attaches concern to the overall problem. Those of us who disagree with him, at least in part, can well understand that the RECORD now being made is something that not only the Senate can well be apprised of in respect to the issue itself, but the discussion itself, especially the arguments of the Senator from Oregon, could well be required reading for many Americans who have not yet been brought face to face with the challenge of a world in conflict.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the kind remarks of the Senator from West Virginia. I cherish his friendship very highly. He and I take a completely impersonal and professional attitude toward our responsibilities in the Senate. He and I are both lawmakers. He and I know that we have an obligation to present our cases impersonally and professionally; and the differences in form of our respective views on the merits of the issues have nothing whatsoever to do with our personal relationship.

As the evidence is presented from time to time, I shall never give up hope that the Senator from West Virginia may share my views on these issues more often than he has this year. I am highly appreciative of the support that he has given me in instances in which he has

been able to vote with me. I wish the RECORD to note that I know of no more impartial, fair-minded Member of the Senate than the Senator from West Virginia. I respect his sincerity and his beliefs. I am sure that he appreciates the fact that I have the same obligation as he to carry out my trust to the people of my State to present the facts as I know them, and to advocate the policy changes that I believe would be in the best interests of the taxpayers.

Mr. President, I close my argument by labeling the amendment, as I did the amendment of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] on interest rates, as a taxpayer's amendment. This is an amendment in behalf of the American taxpayers. This is an amendment that declares that the American taxpayers have a right to have the Congress authorize not more than \$3 billion for foreign aid this year, which is the amount that was appropriated last year.

Adoption of the amendment will take the bill into conference. We know that the House has already authorized a higher figure. The best we can hope for is a compromise between the House and the Senate figure I am proposing. The resulting amount will still be too much. But we should go into conference with this amount of difference between the House and Senate so we can reach a compromise. Even though the amount arrived at will be more than was appropriated last year, it will not be the amount asked for by the President of the United States, which is, at a minimum, half a billion dollars too much.

I yield the floor.

EQUAL TIME PROVISIONS OF THE LAW RELATING TO PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I deem it necessary to refer to a highly privileged matter before the Senate. For this reference, and for such colloquy as may ensue, the distinguished Senator from Washington, chairman of the Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON], the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], chairman of its Subcommittee on Communications, and the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], who have been notified, desire to be present.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. COTTON. I intend to do so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum, to enable Senators to reach the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, 4 years ago, prior to the presidential campaign, the Committee on Commerce, of which the Senator from New Hampshire is a member, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who was and is chairman of its Subcommittee on Communications, which, as the Senate knows, has jurisdiction over matters pertaining to television and radio broadcasting, reported a resolution which temporarily suspended the requirements of the law as to the duty of television stations and networks to give equal time to all potential candidates when time is given to one.

That suspension applied only to candidates for President and Vice President of the United States. It was advocated because it seemed to the Whole Committee, as was well presented by the able Senator from Rhode Island and others, that in this day and age, with television the great medium of knowledge throughout the country, that the people of the country should not be deprived of or limited in their opportunity to see and hear their major candidates for President and Vice President. The resolution provided that should time be given to the major parties, the Democrat and Republican Parties, equal time did not have to be given to candidates of splinter parties, no matter how small or remote.

The joint resolution was passed. I believe it was reported unanimously by the committee, and I believe it was adopted unanimously by the Senate. It was concurred in by the House of Representatives, and took effect.

While, as a Republican, I am not sure that I am in a mood to jubilate over the results of that action, because there is some testimony to the effect that the resulting joint appearance of then candidate Kennedy and candidate Nixon was not to our advantage, I believe we all agree that it is an important and healthy matter, and something that the people of the country have a right to expect, the opportunity of observing the candidates for President and Vice President of the United States.

As the 1964 presidential campaign was approaching, House Joint Resolution 247 was presented. Again it received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Commerce, even though I believe one member of the committee wished to extend its provisions to officials other than President and Vice President.

I invite the attention of Senators to what has occurred, and to the chronological history of this legislation. House Joint Resolution 247, to suspend the equal-time requirements in the case of presidential and vice-presidential candidates, passed the House of Representatives on June 19, 1963, a year ago last June. It passed the Senate, after being recommended by our committee, on October 2, 1963. That was last October. On February 18, 1964, the House disagreed to minor Senate amendments and named conferees. Senate conferees were named 2 days later, on February 20. The conferees met on May 7 and quickly